UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www uspto gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,637	07/10/2003	Antonio Nucci	2315/SPRI.104359	3421

32423 7590 04/04/2008
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER	
LEE, BETTY E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2619	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/616,637	NUCCI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BETTY LEE	2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Januray 15, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims **1, 2, 14, and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doverspike et al. (US 2002/0097671) in view of Li (US 6,707,796).

Regarding claim 1, Doverspike teaches a method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network (an optical network, organized into a general topology of links and nodes 110,..., 190, column: 2, paragraph [0012]), comprising: obtaining one or more mapping options for mapping multiple logical links between one or more pairs of network nodes (A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Column: 5, paragraph [0019]) onto physical paths that are at least relatively disjoint; obtaining a priority order of the network node pairs; (The restoration path is selected from a graph of links in the network which are physically diverse from the service path. For example, in the context of optical network, the links do not share a common fiber span with the service path, Col. 1, paragraph [0006]; Selecting a service path in response to the communication request, accordingly, may be accomplished by computing a path between the source and destination that minimizes some cost metric and which has the required size for the connection request. it is assumed that each OXC node has knowledge of the whole

optical network topology and the number of free channels on each link as well as some opitcal link weight function. A known shortest path algorithm such as Dijkstra's shortest path algorithm may be used to compute the minimal weight path through the network, Col. 6, paragraph [0021] and "The process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Col. 5, paragraph [0019]).

Doverspike discloses the restoration of links, and cost metric but generally remains silent about how to use a priority order of the network node pairs for the purpose of correlating the mapping options with the priority order of the network nodes to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network.

However, Li teaches the priority being predetermined based on which geographic locations are linked by the connection (see col. 7 lines 16-43; The metric value is predetermined based on the distance between nodes.). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use priority order of the network nodes, as taught by Li, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Doverspike for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint for minimal weight path through the network and average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, for enhancing reliability of a telecommunication network.

Regarding claim 2, Doverspike further teaches obtaining the availability of wavelengths in a network (Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column: 1, paragraph [0006]).

Regarding claim 14, Doverspike et al. clearly show and disclose a system for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network, the system comprising: means for obtaining one or more mapping options for mapping multiple logical links between one or more pairs of network nodes onto physical paths that are at least relatively disjoint and means for identifying the optimal mapping using a Cost metric to assign a weight to the paths (Fig. 1 is a mesh network 100, illustratively an optical network, organized into a general topology of links and nodes, Fig. 1 and Column. 1, paragraph [0012]; with reference to Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Column. 2, paragraph [0013]; The restoration path is selected from a graph of links in the network which are physically diverse from the service path. For example, in the context of optical networking, the links do not share a common fiber span with the service path, Column. 1, paragraph [0006]; Selecting a service path in response to the communication request, accordingly, may be accomplished by computing a path between the source and destination that minimizes some cosi metric and which has the required size for the connection request. It is assumed that each OXC node has knowledge of the whole optical network topology and the number of free channels on each link as well as some optical link weight function. A known shortest path algorithm

such as Dijkstra's shortest path algorithm may be used to compute the minimal weight path through the network, Column. 3, paragraph [0021]; the process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Column. 3, paragraph [0019]). However Doverspike et al. is generally silent about obtaining network node priority order; which is utilizing from network traffic carried between the network node pairs.

However, Li teaches the priority being predetermined based on which geographic locations are linked by the connection (see col. 7 lines 16-43; The metric value is predetermined based on the distance between nodes.). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use priority order of the network nodes, as taught by Li, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Doverspike for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint for minimal weight path through the network and average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, for enhancing reliability of a telecommunication network.

Regarding claim 15, Doverspike et al. as modified by Li clearly show and disclose means for obtaining the availability of wavelengths in the network (Doverspike: With reference to Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Fig. 1 and Column: 3, paragraph [0013];

The optical transport systems in Fig. 1 comprise pairs of bidirectional Wavelength Division Multiplexer (WDM) terminals ... The WDM terminals multiplex optical signals at different wavelengths into a single optical fiber for each direction of transmission, Column: 3, paragraph [0013]; Wavelength: Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column. 1, paragraph [0006]).

6. Claims **3-5 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doverspike et al. (US 2002/0097671) in view of Li (US 6,707,796) as applied to claim 2 and 15 above, and further in view of Wolpert (US 6,577,601).

Regarding claim 3, Diverspike in view of Li teaches a method for identifying the optimal mapping of logical links using a cost metric to assign a weight to the paths (Doverspike discloses: The process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Column 3, paragraph [0019]). Doverspike also discloses that link capacity is expressed as a number of wavelengths in optical networking (weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity – which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column 1, paragraph [0006]). Doverspike in view of Li does not disclose using the maximum time delay and the relative time delay

as cost metrics to identify the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network. However, Wolpert teaches using maximum time delay and relative time delay as cost metrics to identify the optimal mapping (This cost, referenced to a particular i-to-j link, may be the maximum or minimum or average bandwidth available, Column 5, lines 51-53; the time delay associated with use of the link, or some other suitable measure of cost of using the particular link, column: 5, lines 51-59; and The preceding development identifies the i-to-j'(u) link for entity transport, using a maximum difference of two J(u)-component vectors, Target and Actual, that are determined iteratively, Column 8 lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use relative time delay and maximum time delay as taught by Wolpert in the method disclosed by Doverspike for identifying optimal maping of logical links to the physical network topology and use wavelength availability as cost metrics for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path for entity transport.

Regarding claim 4, Doverspike in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of obtaining a maximum time delay allowed between each pair of network nodes. However, Wolpert teaches obtaining a maximum time delay and using it to identify the optimal mapping (The objective of the invention is to optimize some measure of network performance, such as overall entity throughput...average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, priority level for an entity, or some other measure of quality of service on the network, Column 3, lines 52-59).

Regarding claim 5, Doverspike in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of obtaining the relative time delay allowed between two or more physical paths. However, Wolpert teaches using maximum time delay and relative time delay as cost metrics to identify the optimal mapping (This cost, referenced to a particular i-to-j link, may be the maximum or minimum or average bandwidth available (if the entity is to be transported along that link, and if the entity is expressed in an electronic format), the time delay associated with use of that link, or some other suitable measure of cost of using the particular link, Column 5, lines 51-59; The preceding development identifies the i-to-j'(u) link for entity transport, using a maximum difference of two J(u)-component vectors, Target and Actual, that are determined iteratively, Column 8 lines 43-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use relative time delay and maximum time delay as taught by Wolpert with the method disclosed by Doverspike for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology and use wavelength availability as cost metrics for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path for entity transport.

Regarding claim 16, Doverspike et al. as modified by Li clearly show and disclose means for identifying the optimal mapping of logical links using a cost metric to assign a weight to the paths (Fig. 1 is a mesh network 100, illustratively an optical network, organized into a general topology of links and nodes, Fig. 1 and Column. 1, paragraph [0012]; With reference to Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Column. 2, paragraph

[0013]; The process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, and Column. 3, paragraph [0019]) and wavelength availability (Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity--which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, column: 2, paragraph [0006]), except the method which further comprising: correlating the mapping options with maximum time delay, the relative time delay, the wavelength availability and the priority order of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network.

However Doverspike et al. as modified by Li is generally silent about using maximum time delay and relative.time delay, the wavelength availability and the • priority order of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network.

In the same field of endeavor, Wolpert clearly shows and discloses using maximum time delay and relative time delay, the wavelength availability and the priority order of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network (This cost, referenced to a particular i-to-j link, may be the maximum or minimum or average bandwidth available, Column: 5, lines 51 -53; the time delay associated with use of that link, or some other suitable measure of cost of using the

particular link, column: 5, lines: 51-59; and The preceding development identifies the i-to-j' (u) link for entity transport, using a maximum difference of two J(u)- component vectors, Target and Actual, that are determined iteratively, Column: 8,lines 43 - 46) and the priority order (priority level of an entity) of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology (for wavelength availability) of a network ((priority level or priority order) The objective of the invention is to optimize some measure of network performance, such as overall entity throughput, average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, priority level for an entity, or some other measure of quality of service (QOS) on the network, column. 3, lines 52-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use maximum time delay, relative time delay, wavelength availability and network node priority order as cost metrics in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Doverspike et al., Wolpert and Askew et al. for the purpose of selecting the logical path that meets defined time constraints and the optimal logical path.

7. Claims **7 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doverspike et al. (US 2002/0097671) in view of Li (US 6,707,796) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Modiano et al. (Survivable Routing of Logical Topologies in WDM Networks).

Regarding claim 7, Doverspike in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of using an integer linear program to perform the correlation. However, Modiano teaches using an integer linear program to find the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network (Section III, Integer Linear Programming Formulation: "Using Theorem I, we are able to formulate the problem of survivable routing of a logical topology on a given physical topology as an Integer Linear Program (ILP)."). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use an integer linear program as taught by Modiano in the method for identifying optimcal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network as in Doverspike in view of Li for the purpose of solving the optimization problem.

Regarding claim 9, Doverspike in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of identifying the optimal mapping for a large internet network backbone. However, Modiano teaches performing the correlation on the NSFNET (111. Integer Linear Programming formulation, paragraph 8: “To illustrate the utility of this approach, implemented the ILP for the NSFNET physical topology ...”). It is well-known in the art that the NSFNET (Figure 2) is a large internet network backbone. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the correlation to identify the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network as in Doverspike in view of Li for the purpose of solving the optimization problem for a large Internet network backbone.

8. Claim **8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doverspike et al. (US 2002/0097671) in view of Li (US 6,707,796) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nucci et al. ("Designh of Fault-Tolerant Logical Topologies in Wavelength-Routed Optical IP Networks").

Regarding claim 8, Doverspike in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the correlation is performed using a Tabu search methodology. However, Nucci teaches using a Tabu serach methodology to find the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network (Section IV, Tabu Search for the SLTDP: The heuristic we propose to use in the solution of SLTDP relies on the application of the Tabu Search (TS) methodology, and Section II, Problems Statement: The Survivable Logical Topology Design Problem (SLTDP) under a given unicast and multicast traffic pattern can be stated to find a logical topology and a mapping that optimizes (maximize or minimize) network function). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skillin the art to use a Tabu serach methodology as taught by Nucci in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physcial topology of a network as in Doverspike in view of Li for the purpose of solving the optimization problem.

9. Claim **11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armitage et al. (Design of a Survivable WDM Photonic Network) in view of Li (US 6,707,796).

Regarding claim 11, Armitage teaches a computer system for identifying optimal mapping of logical links onto the physical topology of a network, with a practical constraint module comprising a mapping option sub-module for obtaining mapping options and a correlation module coupled with the practical constraint module for correlating the mapping options to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network (Simulation Results: "The DAP Algorithm has been implemented in Mathematica 2.2 for Solaris on a SUN-Sparc computer system 20 workstation. The physical topology used for the tests was the ARPA2 network. The virtual topology has been defined by randomly generating clear- channels to obtain a (at least) bi-connected network with a connectivity of 20%, page 13, section: 3.4; "The Virtual Topology consists of a graph representing all the clear- channels that are present in the network. It is the only view of the network available to the higher layer switches. The Physical Topology is the real network, composed of optical links and photonic nodes. The mapping between these two topologies is performed by the design algorithm, page 2, Definitions, paragraph 4; The effects of correlated failures of many clear-channels sharing each physical link can be eliminated - or at least minimized - by using the Disjoint Alternate Path (DAP) algorithm ...The DAP algorithm maps the clear-channels onto the physical network in such a way that, for each of them, there exists an alternate path with same end-nodes, but sharing no optical link with the clear-channel to which it is associated, page 7, Design Protection, The Principle, paragraph 2; SPRA means that the shortest route is always used to route a clear-channel on the physical network. In our case, the length of a route is the number of optical links it uses. At each

step of the global iteration, a Tabu Search is performed, starting from the initial solution of this step, page 12, paragraphs 4 and 5). However Armitage et al. is generally silent about disclosing network node priority sub-module for obtaining a network node priority order; which is derived from network traffic carried between the network node pairs.

However, Li teaches the priority being predetermined based on which geographic locations are linked by the connection (see col. 7 lines 16-43; The metric value is predetermined based on the distance between nodes.). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use priority order of the network nodes, as taught by Li, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Armitage for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint for minimal weight path through the network and average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, for enhancing reliability of a telecommunication network.

10. Claims **12 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armitage et al. (Design of a Survivable WDM Photonic Network) in view of Li (US 6,707,796) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Doverspike et al. (US 2002/0097671).

Regarding claim 12, Armitage in view of Li does not disclose a wavelength sub-module. However, Doverspike teaches a wavelength module for obtaining the availability of wavelengths in the network (as shown in Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross- connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Fig. 1 and Column. 2, paragraph [0013]; The optical transport systems in Fig. 1 comprise pairs

of bidirectional Wavelength Division Multiplexer (WDM) terminals. The WDM terminals multiplex optical signals at different wavelengths into a single optical fiber for each direction of transmission; Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column. 1, paragraph [0006]). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the module for obtaining the availability of wavelengths in a network as taught by Doverspike in the computer system of Armitage in view of Li for the purpose of using wavelength availability as a criteria in identifying the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network.

Regarding claim 13, Armitage in view of Li and Doverspike teaches a computer system wherein the correlation module correlates the mapping options with the network node priority and wavelength availability (Simulation Results: the DAP Algorithm has been implemented in Mathematica 2.2 for Solaris on a Sparc 20 workstation, page 13; "SPRA means that the shortest route is always used to route a clear-channel on the physical network. In our case, the length of a route is the number of optical links it uses. At each step of the global iteration, a Tabu Search is performed, starting from the initial solution of this step, page 12, paragraphs 4 and 5; Our future work will be oriented towards the introduction of maximal capacity for the optical links and nodes (i.e. having a maximum number of channels per fiber, page 16, Conclusion, paragraph 7).

11. Claims **17 and 19** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doverspike et al. (US 2002/0097671) in view of Li (US 6,707,796) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Dawes (US 6,240,068).

Regarding claims 17 and 19, Doverspike in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of determining priority based on the volume of flow on the connection. However, Dawes teaches determining priority based on the volume of flow on the connection (see col. 4 lines 18-25). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Dawes in the system of Doverspike in view of Li to assign priority to larger capacity connections.

12. Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armitage et al. (Design of a Survivable WDM Photonic Network) in view of Li (US 6,707,796) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Dawes (US 6,240,068).

Regarding claims 17 and 19, Armitage in view of Li teaches all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of determining priority based on the volume of flow on the connection. However, Dawes teaches determining priority based on the volume of flow on the connection (see col. 4 lines 18-25). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Dawes in the system of Armitage in view of Li to assign priority to larger capacity connections.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BETTY LEE whose telephone number is (571)270-1412. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9-5 EST and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Betty Lee
Examiner, Art Unit 2619

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619